

cludes translations from the Soviet press (See e.g., Budenz, J.A. 1168-1170), and that a correspondent of the *Daily Worker* is stationed in Moscow.

Additional evidence on this issue consists of the fact that the Communist publication *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* is distributed in the United States to functionaries of Respondent, and copies have been made available by Respondent to meetings of various of Respondent's committees and groups. Petitioner's witness, Matusow, furnishes an example of the effect of an article in *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*. In the summer of 1948, the director of the Jefferson School gave a lecture at the school's summer camp to the effect that the Communists agreed with Tito and Yugoslavia and all the things they were trying to do. A few weeks later, the news was published in *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* that Marshal Tito and the Yugoslav Communist Party had been denounced by the Cominform. The same school director then took the reverse position in his lectures although his only source of information was the Cominform journal (Matusow, J.A. 1056-1057).

Other parts of this report present our findings concerning the well-established requirement of the Soviet Union that vigilance be maintained against "reformists," "opportunists," "stool pigeons", etc.; and the application in this respect of the Communist doctrine of self-criticism. An article by Gilbert Green, high officer of Respondent, entitled "For Communist Vigilance" appears in the May 1950 issue of *Political Affairs*. The article refers to the way in which the Polish and Bulgarian Communist Parties dealt with lack of vigilance—"the reflection of opportunism in the thinking and work of the Party" (Ex. 363, p. 118)—and quotes articles from *Pravda* and *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* on the need for Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism (*Ibid*, pp. 127 and 128). It is reasonable to conclude from the article that the author considered the foreign articles as authoritative instructions.

Some of the articles which are in evidence from *Pravda* contain specific reference to the United States. The March 11, 1950 issue (Ex. 217) contains a speech by Molotov on the international situation in which the following appears (J.A. 1579):

"The democratic camp, which unites the USSR and the countries of the people's democracy, is opposed by the camp of the imperialist powers headed by the ruling circles of the United States of America. (*ibid*, p. 6)

"It is our permanent task and important duty to watch everything that is going on in the camp of imperialism. (*ibid*, p. 6).

(J.A. 1580):

"We fully stand for the Leninist-Stalinist principles of peaceful coexistence of the two systems and their peaceful economic competition. But we know it to be true that while imperialism exists, there also exists the danger of new aggression and that in the presence of imperialism and its predatory plans wars are unavoidable. Therefore, the advocates of a durable peace among the peoples must not be passive and become empty pacifists who are charmed by phrases, but they must everyday conduct a stubborn and still more effective struggle for peace, drawing into it the masses of the people and not stopping before appropriate measures when the imperialists attempt to unleash new aggression." (*ibid*, p. 11)

When read in the light of the considerable evidence of record respecting Respondent's position concerning the United States as an aggressive, imperialist power, and Respondent's policies and activities in the struggle for peace, all of which is set forth in detail elsewhere in this report, it is reasonable to conclude that the foregoing article in *Pravda* demonstrates that the so-called struggle for peace

is used in order "to sweep imperialism and aggression from the face of the earth forever." (Ex. 217, p. 11, J.A. 1580).

Upon the whole record, we find and conclude that articles published in *Pravda* and *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* are understood by Respondent and treated as authoritative instructions or directives as to the line to be taken or the policy to be pursued.

7. Major Programs

We have hereinbefore referred to the fact that Marxism-Leninism, through the so-called Classics, sets forth certain programs and policies as the means of forwarding the world revolution. Particular emphasis as to programs (as distinguished from organization and discipline in the world Communist movement and from the strategies and tactics for the overthrow of imperialism), is placed upon work in and with labor unions, youth, and minority groups (see pages 62 to 68, *supra*).

We also find that such programs were basic requirements of the Communist International and have been and are constantly advanced by the Soviet Union. We find further that Respondent early formulated and has consistently carried out such programs in the United States in conformance with Marxism-Leninism and pursuant to other directives of the Communist International and of the Soviet Union, and that the formulation and carrying out of such programs have as their aims and purposes the advancement of the objectives of the world Communist movement. The evidence as to Respondent's activities in and with labor unions, youth, and minority groups, particularly the Negroes, is voluminous. It would unduly burden this report to set forth the many detailed facts from which the foregoing findings are established. We limit ourselves to what we consider the more significant—those in the past which determine the source and illuminate the present, and those of more or less current use and application which determine the continuity and consistency.

It is clear, and as we read the record not disputed, that major attention is given by Respondent to trade union work, to youth and to "the struggle for national liberation of the Negro people". At issue are the reasons for this attention—why and for what purposes. In other words, this proceeding is concerned with whether these policies and activities were formulated and are being carried out on Respondent's initiative or whether they come within Section 13 (a)(1) of the Act.

The preceding section of this report which establishes the meaning of Marxism-Leninism as understood and used by Respondent shows that trade union work, youth work, and work among the minorities, are given importance in the world Communist movement. Trade Unions and youth under Marxism-Leninism are the "belts" and "levers" without whose aid the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be realized, while the directing force is the Party. Trade unions are "a school of Communism"; youth are "young reserves"; and national minorities have "latent revolutionary capacities". Under the Classics, Communists are taught the necessity of "winning over" and "utilizing" unions in order to carry on the struggle against the government; the necessity of "organizing the Marxist-Leninist training of youth"; and, the necessity of "utilizing" the latent revolutionary capacities of the minority groups for "the overthrow of imperialism".

Additional evidence as to the importance of trade unions, youth, and national minorities in the world Communist movement is furnished by the consistent requirements of the Communist International. The *Theses and Statutes* required that the component member parties carry on Communist work in labor unions and form Communist groups within the organizations to "win over labor unions to Communism" and "to subordinate the unions to the practical leadership of the Party, as the advance guard of the workers' revolution" (Ex. 8, pp. 29-57, J.A. 1331); that organizational relations between youth and the Communist Party be basically defined in every country after the same system

(p. 8) and, that a policy be carried out for the closest union between all national and colonial liberation movements and Soviet Russia—"to support the revolutionary movement among the subject nations (for example, Ireland, *American Negroes*, etc.) and in the colonies" (p. 69, J.A. 1332; emphasis added). In discussing preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the *Theses and Statutes* says in part (J.A. 1323):

"In every organization, union, association—beginning with the proletarian ones at first, and afterwards in all those of the non-proletarian workers and exploited masses (political, professional, military, co-operative, educational, sporting, etc.,) must be formed groups or nuclei of Communists—mostly open ones, but also secret ones which become necessary in each case when the arrest or exile of their members or the dispersal of their organization is threatened; and these nuclei, in close contact with one another and with the central Party, exchanging experiences, carrying on the work of propaganda, campaign, organization, adapting themselves to all the branches of social life, to all the various forms and subdivisions of the working masses, must systematically train themselves, the Party, the class, and the masses by such multifarious work." (p. 16).

The *Programme of the Communist International* further emphasizes these policies and activities. Concerning trade unions, the *Programme* says (J.A. 1456):

"... It is particularly important for the purpose of winning over the majority of the proletariat, to capture the *trade unions* (emphasized in text), which are genuine mass working class organizations closely bound up with the every day struggles of the working class. To work in reactionary trade unions and skillfully to capture them, to win the confidence of the broad masses of the industrially organized workers, to change and 'remove from their posts' the reformist leaders, repre-

sent important tasks in the preparatory period." (Ex. 125, p. 76).

With respect to youth, the *Programme*, in what we find to be adherence to the principles of Lenin and Stalin, points out that the Party relies directly on the mass organizations which include youth, and that systematic work must be carried on among the proletarian and peasant youth (J.A. 1462).

Concerning minorities, the *Programme* points out the necessity to support every movement "against imperialist violence in the colonies, semi-colonies and dependencies themselves"; to carry on propaganda against all forms of chauvinism and against the "imperialist maltreatment of enslaved peoples and races, big and small (treatment of Negroes, yellow labor, anti-semitism, etc.)" (J.A. 1457).

Still further evidence concerning the role to be given trade unions, youth, and national minorities in the world Communist movement lies in the official organ of the Communist Information Bureau. The December 2, 1949, issue of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* contains a report submitted to the Cominform by M. Suslov, representative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, entitled "Defense of Peace And The Struggle Against The Warmongers", which emphasizes the necessity of drawing trade unions into the "camp of the fighters for peace, against the warmongers"; it points out the help that can be furnished by youth; and says that the duty of the Communist and working class parties in the capitalist countries is to merge the struggle for the national independence with the struggle for peace (Ex. 249, p. 3, J.A. 1584-1586). The Zhdanov report, previously herein referred to, includes the following statement:

"Imperialist countries like the United States, Britain and countries near to them become dangerous foes of the national independence and self-determination of nations, while the Soviet Union and the countries of the new democracy are a secure bulwark in the de-

sense of the equality and national self-determination of nations." (Ex. 214, p. 22, J.A. 1577).

Upon consideration of the foregoing and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that trade union work, the training and organization of youth, and national liberation movements, all under the guidance of the Communist Party, are essential elements in carrying out the world communist movement and that these policies were formulated and have been from time to time implemented by Lenin and Stalin, the Communist International, and the Communist Information Bureau. We proceed to examine the record concerning Respondent's use and application of these elements. Evidence as to Respondent's direction in its trade union and national liberation programs is furnished from an article by "Alex Bittelman" which was printed in the March 1934 issue of Respondent's magazine *The Communist* (J.A. 1473-1483). The author, Bittelman, is presently a high official of Respondent. The theme of the article was to seek to make it appear that the Communist International did not "interfere" in American affairs or "dictate" to Respondent, but that Respondent heeded the Comintern in the exercise of Respondent's own conviction and will.

With respect to trade union work, Bittelman wrote in part as follows (J.A. 1476-1479):

"The next milestone in the Comintern leadership for the American party we find on the question of trade union work. * * * The Comintern brought the American militants and lefts closer to the world labor movement and to the basic problems of the American labor

¹ Bittelman's attempt to explain away control by the Comintern is not in accord with the facts. From the record as a whole, it is apparent that the Comintern in fact dominated and controlled Respondent under conditions whereby Respondent could not exercise its own volition in any major respect. An example is furnished, among many, by Kornfeder's expulsion from the Party for failure to follow the instructions of a Comintern representative. See page 130 herein. Cf. Nowell's trial by the Comintern for opposing the Negro policy of the Comintern, pp. 139-140.

movement. The trade union question was one of them. * * * Even the best and most experienced among the left and militant leaders of the American workers * * *, such as the late Charles E. Ruthenberg, as well as the present leader of our Party, William Z. Foster, were able to rid themselves and our movement of the old ballast of opportunism only by coming closer to Leninism and into the Comintern * * * (p. 239).

"It was Comintern advice and guidance that helped the American Communists to turn full face to the building of a left-wing in the reformist unions beginning with 1920; it was the advice of the Comintern that helped formulate a correct solution to one of the basic problems of the American proletariat—the organization of the unorganized into trade unions; it was advice of the Comintern on independent leadership of the economic struggles by the revolutionary elements that helped formulate strike policies and tactics; * * * (p. 240).

"Comintern influence on the development of revolutionary trade union policies in the United States has especial significance. * * * It is significant, therefore, that the first question which Comrade Stalin put to the American trade union delegates was: 'How do you account for the small percentage of American workers organized in trade unions?' * * * the intent of Stalin's question is clear: Why don't you organize the workers in trade unions? Why don't you strengthen them against the capitalists? (pp. 240-241). And it was in this direction that the Comintern threw the full weight of its influence and advice in the American labor movement. * * * Tactics and methods of work might vary, depending upon the state of the class struggle. * * * But the strategic aim always remained the same, and for this aim the Communist Party fights bravely and persistently and with increasing effectiveness. * * * So, we ask again: can any American worker, who is alive to the needs of his class and is willing to fight

for them, find anything to object to in this 'interference' of the Communist International in American affairs? And will he object to the Communist Party of the U.S. accepting and taking deep satisfaction in such 'interference'? No, he will not. * * * " (p. 241).

And concerning the matter of national liberation, the article includes (J.A. 1480-1481):

"Once more came the 'outside' influence of the Comintern, and what did it say? It said that the struggle against discrimination and for Negro rights is a revolutionary struggle for the national liberation of the Negroes, that we must fight for complete Negro equality, and that in the Black Belt the full realization of this demand requires the fight for the national self-determination of the Negroes, including the right to separation from the United States and the organization of an independent state. Furthermore, it was the interpretation of Leninism and its application to the United States as made by the Comintern that showed the American Communists that the agrarian revolution in the Black Belt, * * * is the basis of the national-liberation movement and that this movement is one of the allies of the American proletariat in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. * * * Will the Negro workers, farmers, and city poor consider the Comintern advice on the Negro question 'outside dictation'? No. They will, as they actually do, receive this advice with outstretched arms and will continue in every larger masses to rally around the Communist Party as the leader of the liberation fight. * * * (ibid, p. 244).

A review of Respondent's early documents and the testimony of witnesses who were officials of Respondent during its formative years, establish that Respondent gave to trade unions, youth, and minorities as prominent a place in its structure as did the founders of the dictatorship of the

proletariat in the Soviet Union. Respondent's articles, Publications and other documents, together with the testimony of witnesses, show that throughout its existence and up to the time of this proceeding, Respondent has continued to give importance to trade union work, the mass organization and training of youth, and the struggle for national liberation of the Negroes. It is not necessary to review herein the considerable quantity of evidence that shows the extent of Respondent's policies and activities in furtherance of the world Communist trade union, youth, and national liberation movements; nor to review the large quantity of evidence from which we find that these policies and activities of Respondent represent to a substantial degree the continued following and adherence by Respondent to unrepudiated directives given by the Soviet Union. We limit this report to some of the more significant indications. For clarity, we treat the subjects separately. The evidence hereinafter set forth is in addition to the fact, which we find, that Respondent's policies and activities with trade unions, with youth, and in the struggle for national liberation are based upon and adhere to Marxism-Leninism.

(a) THE TRADE UNION WORK

In 1927, Benjamin Gitlow, at the time a member of the Politburo of Respondent and its Central Committee, was sent by Respondent to the Soviet Union at the special request of the Communist International to attend the Plenary sessions of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (J.A. 265). While there, Gitlow, and other leaders of Respondent, met with Joseph Stalin at Stalin's office at the Headquarters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Stalin directed the Communist Party to make a very serious effort, among other things, to get a foothold in the trade union movement of the United States, in order to attract to the Communist Party a much larger membership, and to await a sharpening of the economic and social situation in the

United States for future revolutionary action (J.A. 265-266).

It will be noted that Stalin's statement is in line with the policies of Marxism-Leninism and of the Comintern, to which we have previously referred. The record shows that Respondent has continuously and consistently placed major emphasis on trade union work to build up the Party (Ex. 376, p. 28, J.A. 1708) and to aid in what Respondent sometimes calls "the class struggle". (Exs. 378, p. 12 and 424, Session 5, Item II).

Petitioner's witness Nowell in 1929 received instructions from the Central Committee of Respondent concerning an elaborate program, later adopted at the founding convention (which Nowell attended as a representative) of a national parent organization—Trade Union Unity League—affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow, for organizing industrial workers in basic industries as well as to foster Communism in unions and for facilitating the proletarian revolution (J.A. 353-354). In 1935, Nowell was instructed as an official of Respondent to gain control of local unions for the purpose of gaining hegemony of the C. I. O. After certain strikes in 1936, Respondent counted on the C. I. O. as part of the People's Front movement to influence United States home and foreign policy in conformity with the International People's Front movement outlined by Dimitroff in his Seventh World Congress speech and resolutions in August 1935 (J.A. 397).

The official minutes of the proceedings of Respondent's governing committees for a number of meetings during the period from late in 1925 to late in 1928 were put in evidence by Petitioner. Many of these minutes show action by Respondent concerning trade union work pursuant to specific instructions and directives from the Communist International. (Examples are Exhibits Nos. 53, 63, 65, 77, 80, 87, and 91).

The record shows that Respondent's tactics in its trade union work have been changed at least three times pursuant

to directives of the Communist International and to effectuate the policies of the Communist International. Originally, the policy was to operate in existing unions. This was changed in 1928 to a policy of concentrating on forming new unions. In 1934, the policy reverted to one of operating in existing unions. This policy is still in existence as established by the evidence herein reviewed. Respondent's united front program in the trade union field which presently receives considerable attention from Respondent, originated with the Communist International. As expressed in the aforementioned article by Alexander Bittelman (J.A. 1477-1478):

“* * * In short, at every stage in the development of the revolutionary trade union movement in the United States (TUEL, class struggle unions of the TUUL, the application of the united front on the trade union field, the fight for trade union unity, etc.), it was with the help of the Comintern that the American revolutionary workers were able to find the correct way, to correct their errors, and, through manifold changes in tactics, to press on to the goal of building a revolutionary trade union movement in the United States.” (Ex. 126, p. 240).

Petitioner's witness Kornfeder taught a course at one of Respondent's schools at the national headquarters in New York in 1932 which covered Communist labor union tactics and strategy, including the organization of secret groups inside of labor unions for the purpose of gaining control of such unions, and the preparation and conduct of strikes.¹ (J.A. 351-352).

At its national convention in 1950, Respondent resolved (J.A. 1722):

¹ His course also included one in Leninism, including the main doctrine calling for the total and complete overthrow of all existing social institutions, the government, and organizations which support the government, as well as the complete elimination of the present state structure and the substitution of a dictatorship led by the Communist Party. (J.A. 351-352).

"We must face the fact that the overwhelming bulk of the organized workers in the country are in the A. F. of L., C.I.O. and independent Right-led unions. It is this which must determine the main direction of all of the Party's work, and especially its trade-union and industrial concentration policy." (Ex. 378, p. 13).

In May 1940, Respondent published in its magazine *The Communist*, an article by Dennis, then and now a high official of Respondent, entitled "The Bolshevization of The Communist Party In The Struggle Against The Imperialist War" which states it is particularly urgent, in accordance with certain conditions outlined by Stalin in *Pravda* in 1925, to conduct more consistent and effective activity among the A. F. of L. Workers. (Ex. 436, pp. 412 & 417, J.A. 1767).

An article by Henry Winston appearing in *Political Affairs* for September 1948 (Ex. 418) entitled "For a Fighting Party Rooted Among the Industrial Workers" was used in discussions at Party Club meetings in October and November, 1948, attended by witness Matusow. The article concerns the necessity for mobilizing the workers in the factories as a main base for a successful fight against war and fascism (Ex. 418, pp. 839-840, J.A. 1741). In a subsequent discussion of the article with witness Matusow, the writer, Winston, said that the question of industrial concentration and the movement of young people, members of the Communist Party youth movement, to basic industries was important at this time because in the event of any "imperialist war" it would be necessary to have people in basic industries to mobilize the workers against such war in an effort to slow down production and to do anything possible to see that such an "unjust war" should not be successful (J.A. 1041-1042). The writer, Winston, is a member of Respondent's National Committee and was the National Organizational Secretary.

The February 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* (Ex. 376) "devoted to reports, speeches, and greetings of the 15th

National Convention of the Communist Party, USA, held in New York City on December 28-31, 1950", contains an article by John Williamson entitled "The Main Direction of the Party's Trade Union Work" (J.A. 1709-1710) which direction, the author says, must be "among the members of the reformist-led unions" (primarily the A. F. of L. and C. I. O.). (J.A. 1709) The article refers to the role of the Party through its thirty-one years existence and concludes that "in general, the trade union policies adopted by our Party were correct" (*ibid*, p. 72). According to Williamson (J.A. 1710):

"The present situation demands from all Party trade-unionists, especially in positions of leadership, closer ties with the Party, better understanding of policies, and a more vigorous fight for Party policies among the masses." (*ibid*, pp. 72-73).

"We know . . . our Party, headed by its helmsmen Foster and Dennis, will lead the working class safely to the port of Socialism." (*ibid*, p. 73).

Petitioner's witness Janowitz was a member of Respondent both during the period it was called the Communist Political Association and after it reverted to the name Communist Party. He joined in 1943 (J.A. 1024) and was still a member at the time he testified in this proceeding. He held minor official positions and was active in Respondent's trade union work in Ohio. He and one Fred Haug, at a meeting of Communist labor members in 1950, were assigned the duty of getting new members for the Party (J.A. 1020). Also in 1950, at a meeting of a Communist Party group at the plant where Janowitz was employed, a state official of Respondent handed out copies of *New Times*, published by the newspaper *Tend* in Moscow, and of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, official organ of the Cominform. The official told the labor members to read and study the documents and pass them on (J.A. 1018). These documents contain articles which strongly

condemn the United States while praising the Soviet Union (Exs. 412 and 413). On the basis of his experience in the Party, Janowitz learned that the Communists are to take advantage of every opportunity that arises to lead the masses, whether it be through depression or strikes or anything else, and are to be the leaders in any movement that unites the masses for the purpose of "getting rid of the capitalist system in America," and substituting Communism (J.A. 1023).

Petitioner's witness Evans attended a regional convention of Respondent in 1951 (J.A. 1101-1102) where a talk was made concerning the policy of industrial concentration and Communist work in trade unions. The witness describes the talk as including reference to the necessity of infiltrating the different unions, especially the key unions (J.A. 1103). His best recollection is that the speaker actually used the word "infiltrating". Similar evidence is furnished by Petitioner's witness Cummings who was taught in Respondent's schools in 1945 that to infiltrate trade union movements was one of the primary objectives of Respondent (J.A. 856).

We have previously referred to the supervision of Respondent's activities by foreign representatives in the United States. In trade union work, the record shows that Petitioner's witness Kornfeder, while an official of Respondent, disagreed with the change in trade union policy in 1934 and was expelled for failure to heed Gerhard Eisler, a foreign representative, who told him not to voice his disagreement (J.A. 322-325). Witness Honig in the early 1930's was given instructions by a Communist International representative in the United States concerning his Party assignment as editor of a publication called "*Labor Unity*" (J.A. 475-477).

Members of Respondent have in the past been sent to the Soviet Union where they received schooling and instructions regarding trade union policies and activities. Four of the witnesses in this proceeding had this experience. Witness Nowell was taught trade union and strike strategy at the Lenin School in Moscow in 1931 (J.A. 369-371). Witness

Honig was sent by Respondent to Moscow in 1932 where he remained until 1935. While there, he studied the operations of the Soviet trade unions and helped the Communist International to formulate policies to be carried out by Respondent in the trade union field (J.A. 469-470). Honig sent back to Respondent reports on decisions made by the Communist International or its affiliated Red International of Labor Unions with headquarters in Moscow, on such things as where the Respondent was to step up its activities and try to produce strikes and try to capture control of unions. The Respondent reported back to Moscow commenting on the instructions it received to the effect that the Party had been attempting and believed it was succeeding in carrying out these directives (J.A. 476-482).

The record shows that under Marxism-Leninism, as well as the Communist International and the Soviet Union, the incitement to strike is a tactic of labor union policy and activity. In the late 1920's a special committee was created by Respondent in an attempt to gain control of the United Mine Workers by utilizing anthracite strikes to Respondent's advantage. In 1934, the Comintern and the Red International of Labor Unions at joint meetings in Moscow, instructed Respondent to press the current situation among the longshoremen and dock workers in San Francisco to the point of a general strike (J.A. 479-480). These instructions were communicated to Respondent by coded message and were carried out (J.A. 480; Ex. 157 (see J.A. 1551-1559)). Manuilsky, then secretary-general of the Communist International,¹ expressed himself as anxious to have the strike since a cardinal principle of Leninism was that a general strike is a rehearsal for revolution or for a seizure of power by the Communist Party (J.A. 481-482).

A strike meeting was called at the Fisher Body Plant in Cleveland in the 1930's at the direction of the Communist International representative, Gerhardt Eisler (J.A. 321-322). In 1940, Respondent instigated a strike at Allis-

¹ Manuilsky in 1945 was Soviet representative to the initial United Nations Conference on international organization held in San Francisco.

Chalmers in order to slow down the production of war materials for Great Britain, then at war with the Soviet Union's then ally, Germany. In 1941, Respondent instigated and led a strike conducted by the aircraft division of the United Auto Workers at the North American Aviation Company in California.

(b) YOUTH WORK

As in the case of Respondent's other policies, activities, and programs, we have taken into consideration in arriving at our determinations regarding Respondent's youth work; the fact that Respondent has republished in the United States and uses as textbooks and guides to action, many of the documents, publications and writings of leading officials of the Soviet Union and organs under its control, such as the Communist International. We have also taken into consideration the fact that various members of Respondent have been trained in the Soviet Union and that some of its present top officials were intimately connected with the Communist International.

The evidence clearly preponderates to establish that while it was a part of the Communist International, Respondent's youth policies were formulated and carried out and its activities performed pursuant to directives of the Communist International. A decision of the Comintern in 1926, contained in the "Resolution on the American Question" and requiring greater attention to the building of a mass Young Communist League and pioneer movement was distributed by Respondent's general secretary to all District, City, Section Committees, and Language Bureaus of the Party (Ex. 40; J.A. 1351-1352).

A resolution of Respondent's Central Committee wholeheartedly approved the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935 "to build the widest anti-fascist youth front through the world." The Central Committee in its resolution called upon the Party to do all in its power to help the Young Communist League accomplish a change in its character indicated by the Sixth World Congress of the Young Communist International and which

had subsequently been approved by the Communist International (Ex. 185, J.A. 1567-1572).

The minutes of various top committees of Respondent for the period from October 1925 through November 1938 disclose guidance by Respondent of the Young Communist League in the United States on the basis of directives from the Communist International. (Examples are Exs. 58, 71, 72, 73)

Additional evidence as to foreign direction of Respondents's youth policies and activities is furnished by Alexander Bittelman's pamphlet issued in 1932 entitled, *The Communist Party in Action* (Ex. 144) and by Respondent's *Manual on Organization of the Communist Party* (Ex. 145). In the pamphlet entitled, *The Way Out*,¹ issued by Respondent in 1934, the Young Communist League is defined as the mass political organization of young workers which leads them in the struggles for their demands and acts as a training school for Communism. It is organizationally independent of the Communist Party, but acknowledges its political leadership and is affiliated with the Young Communist International (Ex. 136, J.A. 1491).

The record establishes that the Young Communist League in the United States was dissolved in 1943 (when the Communist International ceased to exist) and that in its place the American Youth for Democracy was formed as what is known by Communists as a coalition group, being composed of both members and non-members of the Communist Party. It was technically a non-Communist organization, formed as a win-the-war organization designed to recruit and influence as many young people as possible for the Respondent Party. Witness Philbrick, a member of Respondent, was State Treasurer of the American Youth for Democracy and one of its leaders (J.A. 752-753). Witness Matusow joined the American Youth for Democracy in 1946 and through his associations therein became a member of Respondent in 1947. He con-

¹ Manifesto and Principal Resolutions adopted by the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the USA, held in Cleveland, Ohio, April 2-8, 1934. (Ex. 136; J.A. 1490-1492).

tinued to be active in Respondent's youth work and in 1949 assisted in the formation of a new Marxist-Leninist youth organization in the United States—the Labor Youth League (J.A. 1024-1032). The plan of Respondent which was carried out was to disband all Communist youth clubs and to transfer their leadership to the Labor Youth League under Respondent's leadership. Among the books used by the educational committee of the Labor Youth League for training its members are: *Twilight of World Capitalism* by William Z. Foster; *The Tasks of Youth* by Stalin; and *The Young Generation* by Lenin (J.A. 1028-1029).

In view of the policy of the world Communist movement for the mass organization of youth organizationally independent of the Party, and in view of the various directives issued to Respondent, all as heretofore set forth, the following quotation from an article in *Political Affairs* for February 1951 (Ex. 376, J.A. 1711-1712) is relevant to the issues herein:

“This Convention [15th Natl. Convention, Dec. 1950] reflects real progress in our youth work and better understanding of our Party policy in this field.

“The 1948 Convention of our Party gave important emphasis to the need of establishing a non-Party working-class youth organization dedicated to the training of the youth in the spirit of socialism.

“The recent founding Convention of the Labor Youth League . . . has made a deep impression on our whole Party. In this short time the League has proven itself to be a worthy heir of all the best traditions of the Young Communist League, its 25-year record of struggle and its training of many of the outstanding leaders of our Party today. * * * ” (p. 175).

“Experience has borne out fully the correctness of establishing L.Y.L. as an independent non-Party mass

youth organization. The best answer to those comrades who two years ago thought Party youth clubs filled the need for youth work are the thousands of non-Party members of L.Y.L. who are today participating in its activities and learning in a Marxist spirit." (p. 180).

Other contents of this article are pertinent for comparison with the principles of Stalin and of the Communist International, as previously herein set forth, that a matter of decisive importance in the proletariat's fight against imperialist wars is the work among the youth (See Ex. 148; J.A. 1543-1545). This 1951 article says:

"There can be no fully effective fight for peace without waging a struggle against the militarization of youth. * * * (p. 176).

"It follows that these are some of the most immediate issues around which our Party must develop an energetic struggle.

1. No extension of the draft to 18-year olds, veterans and married men. No lengthening of the draft service term. No universal military service and training." (p. 178).

Particularly significant for comparison with the foregoing evidence as to Respondent's present policy concerning work among the youth as part of the fight against imperialism, is the resolution passed by the Communist International in 1928 entitled "The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists" (Ex. 148), which says the greatest efforts must be exerted—not only by the youth organizations, but by all Communists—in combatting bourgeois sport organizations, fascist organizations, military schools, etc., through which the bourgeoisie are training the youth for imperialist wars. Also, it is stated that bourgeois military training of the youth must be combatted. (J.A. 1544).

The obligation which the Sixth Congress of the Communist International (1928) placed upon all Communist Parties to assist in setting up Youth Leagues was approved by Respondent's publication as late as 1950, of an article in *Political Affairs*, entitled "A Generation of Soviet Youth", which refers to such obligation as still authoritative on Party members (Ex. 477, pp. 85-95; J.A. 1775-1777). In this article, the ~~author~~ holds up Lenin and Stalin as models for youth and, after reviewing the role which youth played in bringing about the establishment and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, pictures the lot of the Soviet youth under such dictatorship as one of security, free from unemployment and with the right to leisure, whereas in sharp contrast, the American youth must face the constant fear of unemployment under the scourge of American capitalism. In conclusion, the author declares that solidarity with the Soviet Union and appreciation of its leading role in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, become the touchstones of true internationalism among young people of all countries; and, that it is particularly important in the United States—the center of world imperialism—to bring this wonderful understanding to the young people who are studying Marxism-Leninism and to the Party which helps to guide their youth.

The experiences and careers of various witnesses in this proceeding while engaged in youth work as members of Respondent furnish still further relevant evidence. While in Moscow in 1927 and 1928, witness Crouch as a member of Respondent and a representative of the youth organization, was directed to form in the United States joint units of the Party and the Young Communist League to work together in the Navy yards. (J.A. 403-405). He followed this and other directives upon his return to the United States and upon reporting to William Z. Foster and the national officers of the Young Communist League. (J.A. 413). In 1929, Crouch was a member of the National Young Communist League Secretariat and National Educational Director of the Young Communist League but upon orders given to

the National Convention of the Young Communist League in 1929 by a representative from Moscow, Crouch was not elected National Secretary because of his previous support of Lovestone in the factional dispute of the Party (J.A. 419-421).

Witness Meyer before coming to the United States was a member of the Communist Party in Great Britain where he was active in work for the Young Communist League and was associated with the secretariat of the Central Committee of the British Young Communist League (J.A. 679-680). In 1934, he went to Paris, France, in connection with setting up a world student and youth congress with counterparts in America and Great Britain. This work, while Meyer was in Paris, was under the direction of Walter Ulbricht, who at the time Meyer testified herein was Vice Prime Minister of Eastern Germany (J.A. 680-681). Upon arrival in the United States in 1934, Meyer was assigned by "Gil Green" to youth work in the United States and during the summer of 1934 attended the convention of the Young Communist League of Canada together with "Gil Green" and a Max Weiss from the Young Communist League of the United States (J.A. 682-683).

Witness Philbrick was a member of the Young Communist League for a couple of years before joining Respondent in 1944, of which he remained a member until 1949, continuing his duties in the Young Communist League and later the American Youth for Democracy. The meetings of the American Youth for Democracy which he regularly attended were conducted along the same lines as those held by the Young Communist League which included training in organization, discussion of current activities on the part of young Communists in the group, and educational sessions on Marxism-Leninism (J.A. 753-756).

Respondent's witness Gates joined the Young Communist League in 1931 to attain what he thought to be the answer to the "personal tragedy" of the depression. (R. 14665-14673). His activities in the Young Communist League led to his attaining a position of leadership in Respondent, which he joined in 1933. He participated in League agita-

tion for the Unemployment Insurance Act and about the Scottsboro affair. (R. 14679-14680). He says his duties and activities as head of the League in New York State were almost identical with the general activities of Communists during the period—activities by the young people of New York State on behalf of the economic welfare, democratic rights and peace. Later herein we deal with the evidence as to the ideological aspects of Respondent's trade union, youth and minorities work.

(c) NATIONAL LIBERATION

We have previously herein referred to the fact that Marxism-Leninism, the Communist International, the Soviet Union, and the Communist Information Bureau give importance to what they call the national problem—the “world problem of emancipating the oppressed peoples in the dependent countries and colonies from the yoke of imperialism” (*Foundations of Leninism*, Ex. 121, p. 77). We have also noted that under Marxism-Leninism, the Comintern, the Soviet Union, and the Cominform, the “national problem” is applied to the Negroes in the United States on the theory that the Negro people in the Black Belt of the South constitute an oppressed nation within the territorial borders of the United States.

The record clearly establishes that a main “line” of Respondent is and has been what it calls the struggle for national liberation of the Negro people (See, in addition to the evidence hereinafter summarized, Ex. 378 (J.A. 1722-1723); Ex. 376 (J.A. 1709); Ex. 479 (J.A. 1777)). This proceeding is concerned with whether or not the concept and application by Respondent of the theory as to the right of the Negro people in the Black Belt to self-determination is a program which Respondent arrived at independently.

Respondent's position in this respect is summed up by its witness, Dr. Aptheker, as follows:

“ . . . I would stick to my answer that the Negro question is a national question, it is certainly not

something dictated from abroad or by the Communist International. The Negro question is a national question, is a reflection of objective reality. If it is dictated, it is dictated by life." (R. 16244).

Dr. Aptheker concedes that although certain Negro leaders after the Civil War thought in terms of the concept of Negro nationalism, that was not known to the leaders of Respondent and was not used by Respondent in evolving its position on the Negro question. Also, that at the time the policy of self-determination of the Negro people and the Black Belt was enunciated by the Party, it was not the policy advocated, in the developed sense at least, by the majority of the Negro people or a majority of their leaders. (J.A. 1306).

In the early 1930's, the Executive Committee of the Communist International drew up and passed certain resolutions concerning the Negro question in the United States which were sent to Respondent to be carried out. (J.A. 364). These resolutions established the line of the Communist International to be a demand for self-determination of the Negroes in the United States in the form of unconditional autonomy-separation, or secession from the United States and the establishment of a separate Negro government in the Black Belt of the South. (J.A. 363). As explained by witness Nowell and corroborated by the copy of the resolution in evidence, if no proletarian revolution has occurred, Respondent is to support the rebellious government of the Negro republic in its opposition to the Government of the United States, in order to weaken the Government of the United States and aid Respondent in precipitating and executing the proletarian revolution (J.A. 363-364). During Nowell's membership in the Party, definite steps were taken to execute this program (J.A. 364).

As a member of Respondent, witness Nowell attended the Lenin School in Moscow in 1931, where he was taught that the Negro question in the United States was a part of the colonial question; that the foundation of the colonial problem was imperialist exploitation by the mother coun-

tries; that the Communists were to help colonial countries break themselves away from their mother countries, thereby weakening the mother countries and thus aiding the proletariat and the Communist Parties in those countries to precipitate and carry through a proletariat revolution and the establishment of a communist dictatorship. (J.A. 371-372). Witness Nowell was disciplined while in the Soviet Union for voicing disagreement with the theory and demand for separation and secession by the Negroes from the government of the United States and the establishment of a separate government (J.A. 373-375).

Witness Johnson was active in Respondent's Negro work during his membership from 1930 to 1940. In 1932, he attended Respondent's National Training School in New York City (J.A. 648) where his instructors included William Z. Foster, Gilbert Green, Jack Stachel, Max Bedacht and others who are presently leaders of the CPUSA. (J.A. 648) At the school he was taught by a member of Respondent's Central Committee that members of the Party were to work for equal rights for Negroes which included specifically the right in the Black Belt to rebel and wage civil war to form an independent autonomous Soviet Republic; that the movement toward the establishment of this autonomous Negro Republic should be guided and steered in such a way by the Negro Communists that it would take place simultaneously with the general proletarian or Communist revolution in America (J.A. 654-655). Johnson, who became a Negro member of Respondent's Central Committee, subsequently lectured in the school and before Party meetings and study groups on this program (J.A. 654-655).

In its "*Manual On Organization*" first issued in the 1930's, Respondent said the Negro people are "the other important ally" in speaking of those that the proletariat must win to its cause, and "without whom there cannot be a successful revolution." (Ex. 145, pp. 14 and 15). The *Manual* quotes the following from an "Open Letter" adopted by Respondent's Central Committee in 1933 (J.A. 1534-1535):

“The Party must mobilize the masses for the struggle for equal rights of the Negroes and for the right of self-determination for the Negroes in the Black Belt. It must ruthlessly combat any form of white chauvinism and Jim-Crow practices. It must not only in words, but in deeds, overcome all obstacles to the drawing in of the best elements of the Negro proletariat, who in the recent years have shown themselves to be self-sacrificing fighters in the struggle against capital . . .” (*ibid*, pp. 15 and 16).

Witness Cummings was a member of Respondent from 1942 to 1949. He attended one of Respondent's training schools and many of Respondent's meetings. He also read Party literature. He was taught that the primary objective of Respondent was “to infiltrate trade union movements, Negro organizations, and any organizations that we were able to get into and take control of, to eventually change the system of American Government” (J.A. 856).

Benjamin Davis, National Committee member, in his report to Respondent's 15th Convention, held on December 28-31, 1950, in New York City, said an important feature of the Negro liberation movement is “the international significance of this question”. (Pet. Ex. 379, p. 12); that the “Party's line on the Negro question is a Leninist-Stalinist principle and method of work” (J.A. 1726) and that (J.A. 1726):

“Tendencies to treat the Negro people as mere victims of oppression, without seeing their unique positive and revolutionary role in the struggle against capitalist reaction are a patronizing form of white chauvinism.” (*ibid*, p. 19).

John Williamson, in a report to the 15th National Convention of Respondent in December 1950, pointed out that “the cause of the working class as a whole cannot advance unless a firm alliance is established with the Negro people and unless the working class assumes its full responsibility

in support of the struggle of the oppressed Negro nation for freedom." (Ex. 376, p. 69, J.A. 1709). Jim Jackson, another of Respondent's leaders, puts it as follows:

"The development of higher levels of the Negro national revolutionary struggle in the Black Belt, and the broad mass movement for democratic rights in the South as a whole, is an indispensable prerequisite for insuring the victory of the working class and the American people over the menacing challenge of the ruling class forces of fascism and war *presently*, and for working class victory over capitalism *ultimately*. This is a basic fundamental in the strategy for working class victory, and a special feature of the path to the triumph of Socialism in our country." (Ex. 376, p. 119).

An article in *Political Affairs* for January 1951, entitled "Working Class and People's Unity for Peace! (Main Resolution of the 15th National Convention, CPUSA)" characterizes the Negro people as a "tremendous reservoir of strength for the whole democratic movement" (Ex. 378, p. 11) and states (J.A. 1722):

"Because U. S. imperialism is compelled to cloak with demagogic phrases about democracy and equality its drive for world conquest, particularly its military assault against the colonial liberation movement in Asia, the Negro question tears the mask off Wall Street's real face and assumes the greatest international significance." (*ibid*, p. 17).

(d) IDEOLOGICAL VERSUS POLITICAL AIMS

The foreign-evolved policies, activities, and programs for the carrying out of the world Communist movement, as set forth by the Soviet Union through Marxism-Leninism, the Communist International and otherwise, teach and sanction activities calculated to achieve reforms. The record shows that Respondent has campaigned for and championed reforms such as shorter working hours, non-

militarization of youth and Negro rights. However, the record shows that such activities are political and only incidentally ideological; that the campaigns are primarily carried out not for the ostensible objective of the campaigns but to aid in the accomplishment of the objectives of the world Communist movement.

In addition to the evidence hereinbefore set forth concerning the true purposes of Respondent's trade union work, youth work, and national liberation activities, the following is pertinent.

Petitioner's witness Evans, chairman of a Party club, delegate to a Party regional convention in 1951, and section educational director in 1951, states, on cross-examination as to recent Negro rights activities of his Party club, that a study of Communist tactics and of Communist strategy will refute the declaration that the interest of the Party in the fight for Negroes is focused upon the individual; he shows that, in effect, the fight for Negro rights is an effort by the Party to make the Negro a useful means of helping the Party obtain the victory of socialism (J.A. 1113-1114).

Foundations of Leninism points out that the necessity for the proletariat to support the national liberation movement of the oppressed and dependent countries does not mean everywhere and always, in every single concrete case, but only where the national movement tends to weaken, to overthrow imperialism, and not to strengthen and preserve it. (Ex. 121, p. 79, J.A. 1435-1436).

Respondent's publication *The Communist Party in Action*, written by one of Respondent's present leaders, Bittelman, in 1934, says the importance of the daily struggles concerning "small" grievances must not be underestimated, and quotes the Communist International as stating in effect that only by conducting every day struggles can the Party achieve a united front and lead the working class to a victorious dictatorship of the proletariat. (Ex. 144, pp. 43-44).

In 1924, Stalin wrote in *Foundations of Leninism* (J.A. 1439-1440):

"Some think that Leninism is opposed to reforms, opposed to compromise and to agreements in general. This is absolutely wrong. Bolsheviks know as well as anybody else that in a certain sense 'every little bit helps', that under certain conditions reforms in general, and compromises and agreements in particular are useful . . .

"Obviously, therefore, it is not a matter of reforms or of compromises and agreements, but of the use people make of reforms and compromises . . .

"To a revolutionary, . . . the main thing is revolutionary work and not reforms; to him reforms are by-products of the revolution". . .

"The revolutionary will accept a reform in order to use it as an aid in combining legal work with illegal work, to intensify, under its cover, the illegal work for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie." (Ex. 121, pp. 103-4).

(e) CONCLUSION AS TO MAJOR PROGRAMS

Our summary of the evidence concerning trade union work, youth work, and work among the Negroes, does not include all of the evidence relevant to these subjects. On the basis of the foregoing and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that early in its existence Respondent accepted these policies and programs and has continued to follow them and has not repudiated them; that Respondent's trade union work, youth work and national minorities work could only have as their aim the effectuation of the policies of the Soviet Union with respect to the world Communist movement; and that Respondent's policies and activities in these fields are substantially formulated, carried out, and performed, pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union.

8. Conclusions as to Foreign Policies and Directives

In view of the findings and conclusions hereinbefore set forth in this section of our report, we find and conclude that:

1. Respondent's organizational form is based upon instructions and directives issued by the Soviet Union;
2. Respondent's organizational policies are formulated and carried out to effectuate the policies of the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement;
3. A substantial number of Respondent's leaders have accepted the views and policies of the Soviet Union concerning the advancement of the objectives of the world Communist movement, and have made such views and policies the views and policies of Respondent;
4. Marxism-Leninism, as understood, used and followed by Respondent, consists of a body of doctrine, policies, strategies and tactics intended to bring about the end of capitalism and substitute for it a dictatorship of the proletariat; it has been promulgated and issued by the Soviet Union as the overall philosophy, authoritative rules, directives and instructions governing the world Communist movement;
5. Among other things, by the acceptance and following of the organizational devices of democratic-centralism and self-criticism, as these devices are defined and explained by the Soviet Union, and by the acceptance of and adherence to Marxism-Leninism, Respondent subjects itself to the authority of the Soviet Union;
6. Respondent throughout its existence has and does at the present time teach, advocate, and carry out activities having for their objective the overthrow of the United States Government and other governments which are designated as "imperialist" by the Soviet Union, pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union.

and to effectuate the policies of the Soviet Union, all for the purposes of defending and protecting the Soviet Union and of establishing in the United States (and other countries) a dictatorship of the proletariat patterned after that in the Soviet Union;

7. Respondent has established a press in the United States patterned after that in the Soviet Union which operates as a means of setting forth for Respondent's members the correct line as laid down by the Soviet Union;
8. The press in the Soviet Union and the journal of the Communist Information Bureau are major communication means whereby directives and instructions of the Soviet Union are issued to Respondent;
9. Representatives of the Soviet Union who were sent by it to the United States have been instrumental in putting or keeping in power leaders of Respondent, devotedly loyal and subservient to the Soviet Union, who have continued to be and still are Respondent's leaders; that such representatives have on behalf of the Soviet Union directed the adoption and use of a number of the Respondent's present policies and activities;
10. Among the major programs set forth by the Soviet Union for the accomplishment of the objectives of the world Communist movement are trade union work, youth work, and work with national minorities; and, pursuant to requirements of the Soviet Union, Respondent has made these its major programs in the United States and carries out such programs pursuant to directives issued by the Soviet Union, for the purposes of effectuating the policies of the Soviet Union and advancing the objectives of the world Communist movement;
11. Respondent's policies are formulated and carried out and its activities are performed pursuant to

directives of, and to effectuate the policies of, the Soviet Union, which directs and controls the world Communist movement.

C. Non-Deviation

Section 13(e)(2) of the Act provides that the Board shall take into consideration "the extent to which its [Respondent's] views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organization;".

The petition alleges, in part, on this subject:

"Throughout its existence the Communist Party never knowingly has deviated from the views and policies of the government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist International, the Communist Information Bureau and other leaders of the world Communist movement. Whenever such views and policies have conflicted with the position taken by the Government of the United States, the Communist Party has opposed the position of the United States."

Dr. Philip E. Mosely, Professor of International Relations at Columbia University and Director of the University's Russian Institute, was Petitioner's principal witness for the purpose of establishing that Respondent's views and policies do not deviate from those of the Soviet Union. Dr. Mosely has had a distinguished and active career in the field of international relations and for more than 20 years has devoted his research primarily to Russian political and diplomatic history. While so doing, he has had occasion to analyze carefully the publications and other documents issued by Respondent and the Soviet Union. He is eminently qualified to testify as an expert on evidence relative to the "non-deviation" criterion of the Act (J.A. 507-512).

Dr. Mosely's testimony traced the continuing stream of international questions, upon which both the Soviet Union

and the CPUSA have announced a position. He enumerated some 45 international questions of major import,¹ extending over the past 30 years, with respect to which there was, as revealed by his testimony, no substantial difference between the position announced on each by the Soviet Union or its official and controlled organs and that announced by the CPUSA or its official and controlled organs.

On each specific topic, several exhibits illustrating the views or policies of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA, respectively, were introduced contemporaneously with Dr. Mosely's oral testimony.

At the hearing, Respondent moved to strike Dr. Mosely's testimony and objected to the admission into evidence of the exhibits offered through this witness on the grounds that: (1) basing a registration order thereon would violate the First Amendment; (2) to base a finding of domination and control thereon would violate the Fifth Amendment; (3) it was not proved that the Soviet Union adopted its views first; (4) Respondent was not allowed proper cross-examination; (5) Dr. Mosely was disqualified as an expert; and (6) exhibits purporting to be translations from the Russian language were not properly authenticated. (R. 9056-9059).

Additional objections also raised at the hearing were that specific documents (a) predated the Act;² (b) pertained to subjects not covered in the petition; (c) were not shown to

¹ Among these are the following: the League of Nations; Soviet Union purge trials, 1937; Russo-Finnish War, 1939; Russian invasion of Poland, 1939; Hitler-Stalin non-aggression pact, 1939; attitude toward World War II before and after German attack on Soviet Union; incorporation of Latvia, Estonia; and Lithuania into the Soviet Union, 1940; second front in Europe; dissolution of Communist International, 1943; revision of Montreux Convention, 1946; Communist movements in Bulgaria, Roumania, Hungary, Albania, China, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia; Berlin Blockade, 1948; West Germany; Italian election, 1948; North Atlantic Pact; control of atomic energy; election of Yugoslavia to United Nations Security Council, 1949; Cardinal Mindszenty case, 1949; United Nations police action in Korea; Communist China's intervention in Korea, 1950; seating Communist China in United Nations; Peace Treaty with Japan, 1951; and peace in Korea.

² We discuss the question of pre-Act evidence later in this Report under the caption "Legal Discussion", pp. 236 to 238, *infra*.

express authoritative views; (d) did not establish a parallel view; (e) did not support allegations of the petition; and (f) did not support Dr. Mosely's testimony. (R. 10881-10920).

We have reviewed the entire record relative to all of the aforementioned contentions of Respondent. Those pertaining expressly to Constitutional issues will be treated later in this Report under "Legal Discussion".¹ Viewing the record in a light most favorable to Respondent, we find no error in the Panel's acceptance of this particular evidence or in its rulings with respect thereto.

Passing to its exceptions, Respondent took issue in the manner described heretofore (pp. 4-5, *supra*) with every statement in the Panel's decision concerning non-deviation. These exceptions are generally contentious, lacking in specificity and without merit; and, except to the extent that they pertain to matters discussed below or are incorporated in our findings, they do not warrant further comment.

In its brief accompanying its exceptions, Respondent contends that the Panel's concept of the non-deviation criterion is (a) irrational, erroneous and based on incompetent evidence, and (b) involves conclusions which Dr. Mosely admitted he could not draw. Respondent further asserts that the Panel's misconception in this regard is reflected by rulings which prevented it from showing on cross-examination of Dr. Mosely and in its affirmative case that its views preceded those of the Soviet Union, were correct and reasonable, were arrived at independently by Respondent, and coincide with universal opinion and the best interests of the American people.

With regard to these contentions, we find no material error or irrationality in the Panel's conception of this criterion. We likewise find no merit to the contention that the Panel reached a conclusion which the witness Dr. Mosely admitted he could not make. Dr. Mosely stated in effect that his expert testimony was directed toward analyzing the basic line of thinking, analysis and advocacy of views and policies of the Soviet Union and Respondent

¹ See pp. 239 and 240, *infra*.

and not at the process by which Respondent arrived at a given position on an international question, i.e., whether independently of the Soviet view or as a result of Soviet domination and control of Respondent. We do not understand this to conflict with, or detract from, the purport of his testimony. Whether the oral and documentary evidence adduced through Dr. Mosely tends to establish domination and control of Respondent when viewed with the evidence of record in the light of the other criteria of Section 13(e) of the Act is for the Board's determination.

With respect to the remaining contentions related above, we conclude that Respondent was permitted reasonable opportunity to cross-examine Dr. Mosely and to establish its affirmative case. It is noted in passing that Dr. Mosely was cross-examined for 15 days. Respondent was not permitted, and rightly so, to put in issue the merits of the views or policies of Respondent, which views and policies were placed in evidence by Petitioner to establish "non-deviation". For in applying the "non-deviation" criterion, the Board is required to view cumulatively the spread of the evidence relating to the non-deviation of views and policies without deciding the merits of any views or policies of Respondent.

Respondent has contended throughout that the term "non-deviation" as used in the Act should be interpreted to mean "following a course already established" and that since a substantial number of Petitioner's exhibits illustrating the view or policy of Respondent predated the exhibits expressing the Soviet view or policy, these exhibits did not show that Respondent adopted a previously established view of the Soviet Union but the contrary. Assertedly, this consideration was reinforced by the absence of proof by Dr. Mosely to establish that the announcement of the Soviet view had preceded the Respondent's expression on the same topic.

Petitioner, on the other hand, took the position at the outset of Dr. Mosely's testimony, and in advance of the raising of this objection by Respondent, that the exhibits under discussion were offered in evidence merely to illus-

trate the oral testimony of Dr. Mosely on the respective international questions, in order to show a documentary basis for his testimony; and that the documentary evidence was not intended to establish the date of the first announcement thereon by either the Soviet Union or the CPUSA. Petitioner further argued that in many instances the Soviet view or policy must necessarily have come first, particularly since the first announcement of the Soviet Union's position may have taken the form of a *fait accompli*, as for example, its unexpected signing of the Hitler-Stalin non-aggression pact.

As stated by Petitioner, these exhibits were placed in evidence to afford a documentary basis for the testimony of Dr. Mosely and not to establish the first announcements of views and policies. Moreover, we have considered Dr. Mosely's testimony with other evidence of record,¹ all of which establishes that Respondent invariably follows the views and policies of the Soviet Union. We do not believe, therefore, that the date sequence of the exhibits placed in evidence through Dr. Mosely is dispositive of whether Respondent's views and policies have deviated from those of the Soviet Union.

We now proceed to set forth our findings on the evidence established by Dr. Mosely and other witnesses relative to this criterion.

The nature of the evidence adduced through Dr. Mosely is illustrated by his testimony, and documents submitted through him, concerning the non-aggression Pact entered into by Hitler and Stalin, known as the Hitler-Stalin Pact of August 23, 1939. He established the identity of views between the CPUSA and the Soviet Union prior to the making of this Pact (J.A. 536-539); the parallel attitude of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA toward World War II while this Pact was in effect (J.A. 536-537, 539, 541-545, 548); and the simultaneous change of policy on the part of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA after June 22, 1941, the

¹ This consists of documentary evidence, and oral testimony of witnesses Gitlow, Kornfeder, Markward, Matusow, Budenz and others, as illustrated later in this finding.

date on which the Pact was abrogated by the German attack on the Soviet Union (J.A. 548-551, 556-557).

To further illustrate the evidence, it is established that prior to the making of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, Respondent, conforming to the position taken by the Soviet Union, had denounced Fascism in Nazi Germany as the main threat of aggression in the world and as the foremost danger to peace and democracy (J.A. 536, 538-539) notwithstanding that the signing of the Pact by the Soviet Union on August 23, 1939, constituted a reversal of the anti-Fascist line and caused considerable consternation and defection among Respondent's leaders and members, Respondent immediately switched to the Soviet Union's position and hailed the non-aggression agreement as an important contribution to peace (J.A. 539, 878-879); when Germany invaded Poland, Respondent echoed the Soviet assertion that the Pact continued to be an important contribution to peace as it would limit the spread of war (J.A. 537, 539); and, further, that opposition to this territorial expansion was the work of war mongers (J.A. 529); after the defeat of Poland, the Soviet Union and Respondent both took the position that England and France were guilty of prolonging the war (J.A. 537, 539-540); that the war was an "unjust" and imperialistic war and that no country which hoped for peace should assist England and France (J.A. 539-543, 545-548). Respondent, like the Soviet Union, strongly opposed lend-lease aid by the United States to Great Britain (J.A. 545-547). Immediately after the German attack on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, the latter reversed its position and almost simultaneously Respondent did the same; both suddenly concluded that the character of the war had changed (J.A. 548, 550-551); World War II became in the eyes of both a "just" war; they urged that the "Allies" should have the support of the United States and of all freedom-loving people; they advocated aid by the United States to Great Britain and to the Soviet Union (J.A. 548, 550), and Respondent branded those in the United States who opposed

¹ See discussion of "just" and "unjust" wars, pp. 230 to 233, *infra*.

such aid as agents of Hitler (J.A. 550). Soon after the German attack on the Soviet Union, Respondent joined with the Soviet Union in demanding the opening of a second front "now" with the United States participating therein (J.A. 556-557).

The views of the Soviet Union and Respondent likewise coincided on the trials and executions in the Soviet Union in 1937 (J.A. 448-450, 522-525, 840-841, Exs. 172, 173, 175); Respondent echoed the statements of the Soviet Union concerning the Russo-Finnish War (J.A. 525-527, 844; Exs. 176, 177, C.P. Ex. 39); the same situation prevailed in regard to the absorption of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union and Respondent assumed the same position in 1947-1949 with regard to the internal crisis in Greece in that they both favored the actions of the Greek guerillas (Exs. 214, 241, 242, 243); and they coincided in their views on the change in the Czech government in February 1948 (J.A. 578-584; Exs. 214, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224).

The evidence relative to this criterion further established that, prior to the Cominform resolution which attacked the Tito government, Respondent paralleled the Soviet Union in giving approval of the course of post-World War II developments in Yugoslavia and of the Tito government (J.A. 612-614). On June 28, 1948, however, the Cominform issued a resolution, initiated assertedly through an exposure by the Soviet Union, which attacked Tito and his regime in bitter terms; among other charges, Tito and his leaders were derided for having entertained the hope that Yugoslavia could build "socialism" without "the support of the Soviet Union" (Ex. 344, J.A. 1659-1663). One day later, on June 29, 1948, Respondent also reversed its position on the Tito government and issued a statement lauding this Cominform resolution and criticizing the Tito regime for showing hostility to the Soviet Union and for attempting to "curry favor with Anglo-American imperialism" (Ex. 260, p. 699).

The views and policies of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA were identical on the question of the Berlin Block-

ade in 1948 (J.A. 603-604); they have likewise coincided on the course of events in post-World War II Germany (J.A. 602-605; Pet. Exs. 244, 248, 397, 398).

The views and policies of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA have been substantially the same with regard to the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, ECA, and the North Atlantic Pact, namely, that the United States participation and leadership in these measures are for the aggressive purpose of domination of the world; whereas the views and policies of the Soviet Union and Respondent, on the other hand, allegedly support peace and democracy (J.A. 606-612).

The Soviet Union and Respondent took the same position in regard to the Stockholm Peace Petition in 1950¹ in asserting that all true proponents of peace should support the petition, which was issued by a committee of the World Peace Congress (J.A. 624-627; Ex. 268). Respondent supports the Soviet Union's position, as opposed to that of the United States, concerning control and inspection of atomic energy (J.A. 630-632; Exs. 241, 273, 274). The same situation prevails regarding the seating of Yugoslavia in the United Nations Security Council, with Respondent supporting the Soviet Union's opposition to the United States on this question (J.A. 635-637; Exs. 277, 278, 279, 280). The Soviet Union and the United States Government have taken opposite positions with respect to the representation of China in the United Nations; Respondent maintains the Soviet position which favors the seating of the representatives of the Chinese Democratic Peoples Republic and the exclusion of representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government (J.A. 632-636, 837-838; Ex. 275, 276). Respondent concurred with the views of the Soviet Union in opposition to the United States peace treaty with Japan (J.A. 718-721; Exs. 210, 314, 315, 316, 317).

¹ Respondent again expressed this view regarding the Stockholm Peace Petition in December, 1951 (Ex. 488, J.A. 1779-1781).

The CPUSA's position in support of the conduct of the Czechoslovakian government in the William Oatis case (American correspondent) coincides with the Soviet Union's position thereon (J.A. 721-723, 845; Ex. 318, 319).

The testimony and documentary evidence also established that the CPUSA and the Soviet Union express the same views regarding Korea; both maintain that the Syngman Rhee government is a reactionary "puppet regime" (J.A. 637-646, 862-864; Exs. 268, 269, 270, 281, 282, 286, 289); both vigorously condemn the hostilities in Korea as the direct result of American imperialism and aggression; both insist the United Nations police action is illegal and aggressive toward North Korea (J.A. 637-646; 724-726, 862-866; Exs. 282, 288, 289); both maintain that this war constitutes a threat to the Chinese Peoples Republic which justifies the Chinese Communist intervention in the conflict (J.A. 637-646, 707-708, Ex. 283); both assert that the Chinese intervention in support of North Korea aids the struggle of "peace-loving" peoples of the world, which are led by the Soviet Union, against the program of the American imperialist aggressors (J.A. 645-646; 707-708; Ex. 283, 290, 299); both charge that the United States desires continuation and expansion of the Korean War (J.A. 726; Exs. 320, 323); both insist that the United States has disrupted and delayed cease-fire negotiations and blocked peace in Korea (J.A. 726; Ex. 320, 321, 322, 323); and both demand acceptance of the proposals for cease-fire and "peace" made on behalf of the North Korea Peoples Republic (Ex. 320, 321, 322, 323). In short, Respondent and the Soviet Union, regarding Korea and the Korean conflict, coincide completely in their condemnation of the policies of the United States Government in its support of the United Nations in Korea.

In addition, other witnesses established that, during the existence of the Communist International, Respondent did not deviate from Comintern instructions in a single instance (J.A. 336, 668); further, that a CPUSA member could not disagree with a position taken by the Cominform and con-

tinue to remain a Party member¹ (J.A. 780-781); that in those instances in which the policies of the United States and the Soviet Union appeared to be in conflict, Respondent at no time expressed sympathy with the policy of the United States Government (J.A. 748-749); that the Soviet Union was never criticized in Party circles, but, on the contrary, it was a cardinal rule to praise the Soviet Union at all times (J.A. 782, 1161); that in 1941 and prior thereto, a Moscow news agency supplied Respondent with political and other news dispatches which were distributed to Respondent's leaders so that they could keep informed of the "party line" and its interpretations; and that the aforementioned dispatches were regarded by Respondent as being directives from the Soviet Union on positions to be taken, and were implemented accordingly (J.A. 1169-1171). It was stated in Respondent's 1942 Constitution (Ex. 328, Art. VI, Sec. 15) that no CPUSA member was permitted to have a personal or a political relationship with "Trotskyites", a term used in CPUSA and Soviet Union circles in an odious sense to signify persons sympathetic to a system of deviation from the official "line" of the Soviet Union (J.A. 264).

It is also shown by evidence, in addition to that adduced through Dr. Mosely, that throughout the entire existence of Respondent, including the present, it has agreed with the view of the Soviet Union to the effect that the United States is an imperialistic nation which seeks world domination and whose government should be overthrown, whereas the Soviet Union is a true democracy in search of peace and its aims should be fostered.² When the United States was a potential or actual ally of the Soviet Union this chant was not sung by either the Soviet Union or the CPUSA.

¹ There have been instances of internal deviation within the CPUSA. Such instances usually resulted in dismissal from the Party, as in the cases of Gitlow and Browder. This, of course, in no wise detracts from these findings. In fact, these instances lend even greater weight to the findings, in that they highlight the intolerability with which any deviation is regarded by both Respondent and the Soviet Union.

² See "Imperialism", pp. 81 to 103, *supra*; and "Allegiance", pp. 215 to 233, *infra*.

Respondent made no effort to rebut the condition clearly shown to exist by Petitioner's evidence. It offered no evidence to establish a conflict between the policies of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA at any time or on any occasion. Nor is there any evidence to show that, where the views or policies of the United States as officially announced conflicted with the views of the Soviet Union, the CPUSA in any instance took a position thereon in harmony with the views of the United States, though its witnesses were repeatedly invited on cross-examination to show such an occasion. Each of Respondent's witnesses evaded a direct answer to the question and, curiously enough, each gave a similar circuitous and equivocal answer stating that Respondent's policies reflect what it conceives to be the true national interest of the American people; that if the views or policies of Respondent and the Soviet Union are similar or identical, this proves only that the national interests of the people of the two nations are the same; that Respondent takes the view that the true national interests of all people are identical; and that Respondent arrives at its views independently (J.A. 1224-1227, 1249-1250, 1252-1254, 1283-1284, 1299-1300).

These platitudes do not negate Petitioner's evidence. Respondent's witnesses were unable to cite a single instance throughout its history where, in taking a position on a question which found the views or policies of the Soviet Union and the United States Government in conflict, the CPUSA had agreed with the announced position of the United States; nor could they show a single instance when the CPUSA had disagreed with the Soviet Union on any policy question where both Respondent and the Soviet Union have announced a position.

The testimony of Dr. Mosely and documents submitted through him embraced a tremendous area of international problems on which the positions of Respondent and the Soviet Union coincide. We have pointed out a representative portion of them. The uniformity is constant and on a wide variety of questions, and is corroborated by other evidence of record.

In evaluating the foregoing evidence we have taken into consideration that during the early history of Respondent, when it was openly a member of the Communist International and less secretive about its objectives, it accepted and effectuated the principles and tactics of the Comintern pursuant to an express condition of membership in the Communist International which required Respondent so to do (Exs. 8, 6(c)). Moreover, in weighing the evidence set forth herein we have considered Respondent's adherence to Marxism-Leninism,¹ which in its essence requires acceptance by it of any position that the Soviet Union determines will advance the world Communist movement.

The record precludes the conclusion which Respondent would have us draw, i.e., that the uniformity of views results from "sharing a common scientific outlook" and independent application of principles by it and the Soviet Union. The great weight of the evidence is to the contrary.

We find on the entire record that the views and policies of Respondent throughout its history invariably coincide with the views and policies of the Soviet Union. Moreover, Respondent conforms immediately to each reversal in the Soviet Union's views and policies.

We conclude and find that Respondent's views and policies do not deviate from those of the Soviet Union.

D. Financial Aid

We are directed by the Act to consider "the extent to which it [Respondent] receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization" (Section 13(e)(3)).

The petition alleges:

"The Communist Party now receives and from time to time in the past has received financial aid, from or at the direction of the government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist International and the Communist Information Bureau * * *"

¹ See "Marxism-Leninism", pp. 38-81, *supra*.

The CPUSA sent members to the Soviet Union to attend schools located there, notably the Lenin Institute in Moscow. The expense for their travel and subsistence was borne by the Communist International (Gitlow, J.A. 528-529; Honig, J.A. 484-485; Nowell, J.A. 392; Kornfeder, 303-304; Exs. 72, 83, 87, 101).

In the 1920's and 1930's, the Communist International financed the travel of CPUSA officials and members to and from the Soviet Union and on missions to other countries for the purpose of orientation and the conduct of official business on behalf of international Communism, such as fulfilling representative functions in the Communist International; in addition to their subsistence, salaries were paid them in some instances by the Communist International for the duration of their stay in the Soviet Union (Crouch, J.A. 401-402; Honig, J.A. 484-487; Kornfeder, J.A. 327-330; Exs. 63, 80, 89, 102).

During the period from 1920 to 1934 the CPUSA received financial assistance from the Soviet Union, often in the form of subsidies, which are described more fully in subsequent findings under this heading (Gitlow, J.A. 224, 259-261; Kornfeder, J.A. 327-329; Honig, J.A. 487-489; Ex. 102-A).

The Communist International contributed the sum of \$50,000 to Respondent for the purpose of financing the 1924 campaigns of William Z. Foster and Benjamin Gitlow, the Communist Party candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, respectively (J.A. 272); and the Communist International likewise contributed a substantial sum to Respondent to finance the campaigns of these candidates on the same ticket in 1928 (J.A. 257-258, 285-291).

The Communist International directed the establishment of the *Daily Worker* and contributed the sum of \$37,000 to Respondent in 1924 for this purpose (J.A. 229-230; Ex. 47). During the period of 1936 to 1938 the expenses of the *Daily Worker* were reduced because international news was received from the International Press Correspondence, an organ of the Communist International (J.A. 656-657, 1117-1118).